

Steens Mountain Advisory Council

Meeting Minutes

January 23 and 24, 2003

Members Present:

Hoyt Wilson, Grazing Permittee, Princeton, Oregon
Jerry Sutherland, Vice Chair, Environmental Representative – Statewide,
Portland, Oregon
Tom Harris, Chair, Mechanized or Consumptive Recreation, Keno, Oregon
Alice Elshoff, Environmental Representative – Local, Frenchglen, Oregon
Wanda Johnson, Burns Paiute Tribe, Burns, Oregon
Stacy Davies, Grazing Permittee, Frenchglen, Oregon
Cynthia Witzel, Recreation Permit Holder, Frenchglen, Oregon
Jason Miner, Fish and Recreation Fishing, Portland, Oregon
Richard Benner, No Financial Interest, Portland, Oregon
E. Ron Harding, Wild Horse Management, Hines, Oregon
Harland Yriarte, Private Landowner, Eugene, Oregon
Steve Purchase, State Liaison, Salem, Oregon

Members Absent:

Mike Golden

Designated Federal Official (DFO):

Tom Dyer, Burns District Manager, Bureau of Land Management (BLM),
Hines, Oregon

Designated Federal Official Assistants:

Rhonda Karges, Management Support Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Liz Appelman, Budget Analyst, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Tara Wilson, Public Affairs Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Presenters:

John Neeling, Wilderness Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Dave Harmon, State Office Wilderness Lead, BLM, Portland, Oregon
Gary Foulkes, District Planning & Environmental Coordinator, BLM, Hines,
Oregon
Jim Buchanan, Acting Steens Manager, Acting Andrews Field Manager, BLM,
Hines, Oregon
Mark Sherbourne, Natural Resource Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Jeff Rose, Fire Ecologist, BLM, Hines, Oregon
Matt Obradovich, Wildlife Biologist, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Facilitator:

Dale White

Commenting Public:

Susan Hammond, Hammond Ranches, Inc.

Brent Fenty , Oregon Natural Desert Association, Bend, Oregon

Don Renie, private landowner

Others Present:

Mark Armstrong, Public Affairs Officer, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Sandy Berain, Associate District Manager, BLM, Hines, Oregon

Bill Tubesing, local resident

Martha Tubesing-Hendersen, local resident

Jennifer Thies, Enviroscientists, Inc., Reno, Nevada

Dick Day, CRT Harney County

Barbara Cannady, Capital Press

Walt ?? (last name illegible)

Darren Brumback, BLM

Michael Weston, BLM

Doris Cooper, BLM

Lance Okeson, BLM

Patti Wilson, BLM

Kelly Hazen, BLM

Jim King, BLM

Cam Swisher, BLM

Manny Berain, BLM

Rick Hall, BLM

Jill Benefield, BLM

Lee McConnell, BLM

Dave Ward, BLM

Bill Anderson, BLM

Welcome, Introductions, Housekeeping and Agenda

The meeting was called to order, introductions made, and the agenda reviewed and amended as necessary.

Chairman Update:

Tom Harris talked of the need for a quorum at these meetings as well as an understanding other commitments may take members away. Tom also brought up the need to revisit some of the motions made at the last meeting needing to be ratified by this quorum. Included in member packets is a document called "Partners Across the West", which was issued at a meeting of all Resource Advisory Council (RAC) presidents and might help this group as well.

DFO Update:

Tom Dyer introduced John Neeling, the new Wilderness Specialist for the District, as well as announcing the selection of Karla Bird as the Andrews Field Manager. He reported work is progressing on the Access EA which should be out about March 1. The remaining SRP EAs will be out in April, and the Grazing Access EA should be out in June.

Rhonda told members they would find copies of the proposed changes to the Charter in the member's packets. She said the Washington Office changed some wording replacing what the SMAC proposed. She also informed the Council it was not possible to delete the Federal Register portion, because it was a regulation and, therefore, required.

Motion made to accept the revised changes to the charter (Jerry made, Tom Harris seconded)

Discussion: None. No objection to motion

Consensus Decision: Accept the revised changes to the charter.

Tom Dyer reported the BLM will soon be issuing the *Federal Register* notice calling for nominations. Those positions up for reappointment are currently occupied by Harland Yriarte, Jerry Sutherland, Cindy Witzel, and Jason Miner.

Tom Dyer briefed the Council on the WSA inventory packet received from outside the agency. The BLM must go through the packet and make determinations of the validity of the proposal doing checks on-the-ground as well as an inhouse coordination review. He asked any pertinent information members are aware of be given to the BLM as well. He hopes to have this process completed by June.

In response to a question, Dave Harmon stated the current WSAs are not part of this review. They were designated by Congress and only that body can change their status. There is no means of addressing the existing WSAs.

Dave Harmon explained some of the previous inventory efforts and the processes undertaken. He pointed out the BLM is required to consider it as information for the planning process. It doesn't mean BLM has to agree with it, but they must look at it to determine if the condition of the lands have changed since the initial inventory. If conditions have changed, the BLM must then determine if they meet the criteria for WSA. If they do, they would go forward in the RMP as a proposal. If not, then they could be dropped out.

Tom Dyer stressed the importance of gathering as much information as possible in order to make the best decisions. Council members discussed the various impacts of this packet, the possible means of gathering information, the processes involved in completing the reviews, when submissions of this type are appropriate, and what will happen on the land in the interim before this package has completed the process. The projects in process in these areas have been placed on hold until the WSA process is completed.

Jim Buchanan addressed the Council concerning two of the EAs in the perspective area. Jim updated the members on the fence proposed along Highway

205 to keep horses off the highway, and the problems the horses have been creating for some time now. Because of the safety issues involved, the BLM is proposing to go ahead with the fence but not the associated pipeline. Even though there is only one water source once the fence is constructed, the pipeline would be addressed after the proposed WSA issues are resolved.

Jim Buchanan explained gap fencing had been the selected alternative for Bradeen Crossing. Since then, an on-the-ground visit has proved this type of fencing is not going to work. Jim reviewed the current proposal and the difference from the gap fencing.

Jim also updated the group on the proposed Bridge Creek prescribed burn, which Jeff will talk about in detail later in the meeting.

RMP Update:

Gary Foulkes, District Planning and Environmental Coordinator, brought the council up to date on the status of the RMP. He had requested some input from SMAC members on two different aspects of the RMP but had yet to receive any from them. He reported staff and the contractor are working hard to meet the deadlines. The core team will be going to Reno to meet with the contractor in February. Currently it is believed the preliminary draft will be out the end of March. He will get as much of the chapters to the SMAC as possible prior to the April meeting.

Action Item Review:

Council members went through the list and updated it as appropriate.

Chair, Vice-Chair & Facilitator Roles:

Members were instructed to read the information in their packets in preparation for a discussion tomorrow.

Wilderness – LAC Zone Definitions and Map Review:

Tom Dyer led the discussion, which started with a review of the “Summary of Recreational Components for Each Zone in Wilderness” definitions. The group at the last meeting made a recommendation for approval but did not have a quorum.

The group discussed the best definition for routes/trails/paths (whatever it is called), so it is easy to determine if nonmotorized or motorized is meant.

Motion made to insert nonmechanized in front of trail and route in the text and in the definitions. (Jerry moved, Alice seconded)

Discussion: Members talked of the definitions of a route or trail and how they are differentiated, what constitutes a route or way, and the ability to travel cross country. The suggestion was made to call them annual and perennial paths. It

was also pointed out that how definitions are implemented would have a bearing on how they are composed.

Dick called for the question on mechanized/nonmechanized.

An objection was heard.(Dick)

Roll Call Vote: Dick – No; Wanda – No; Jerry – Yes; Alice – Yes; Hoyt – Yes; E Ron – Yes; Jason – Yes; Cindy – Yes; Tom Harris – Yes; Stacy – No; Harland - Yes

Motion failed, due to less than nine votes in favor.

Motion made and seconded to substitute track for route (Dick moved, Tom Harris seconded).

Discussion: Some concern was expressed as to how that wording would clarify motorized vs. nonmotorized. Using “track” was felt by some members to confuse the issues even further.

Dick withdrew the motion and Tom Harris agreed.

Members discussed their various concerns with the non-motorized/mechanized, trail, passage, or route definitions.

Motion made that unless otherwise noted in the EIS, a trail is defined as a nonmotorized path that remains from year to year and a passage is a nonmotorized path that may appear one season but is healed the next.

Jerry withdrew the motion.

Motion made to substitute passage for route and leave the definitions as they are (Cindy moved, Stacy seconded).

Discussion: None. No objection heard.

Consensus Decision: Substitute passage for route and leave the definitions as they are.

Motion made to accept the entire package (Hoyt made, Dick seconded).

Discussion: The group discussed that if it became necessary, it might be possible to revisit the definitions.

No objection to consensus heard.

Consensus decision: Accept the entire package.

Public Comment:

Susan Hammond, Hammond Ranches, Inc., believed the SMAC is to act under the Steens legislation. The original community supported the wilderness designation, and it was important it be a balanced act because it takes a certain amount of nonwilderness to support economic viability. She believes the new wilderness proposal is irresponsible. She believes it is the objective of some groups to make this committee nonfunctional. She stated cooperation is most important with private property owners and things like this wilderness proposal really make private property owners throw their hands in the air. Also when looking at this new wilderness proposal, people should realize these people had to trespass on private land in order to produce this report. Susie reiterated she believes their purpose is to make this legislation dysfunctional and to make this committee dysfunctional.

Wilderness Map Review:

Tom explained the various maps, including the one depicting the zones this Council agreed to at the last meeting.

Stacy pointed out the Kiger Overlook should have been in Zone 3 and the trail down in the Kiger should be Zone 3. There was one area on Lauserica that needed to be adjusted slightly to make sense.

Motion made and seconded to accept the map as amended. (Hoyt moved, Dick seconded).

Discussion: None. No objection to consensus heard.

Consensus Decision: Accept the map with the proposed adjustments.

Wilderness Monitoring:

John Neeling, Burns District Wilderness Specialist, introduced himself and gave a short biography. John discussed a few options of monitoring as well as what could be used as indicators and how they could be used. The Council discussed the different monitoring needs, including tribal uses and the possible ways to accomplish them.

Recreation Outside of Wilderness:

Members brainstormed the issues for recreation outside of wilderness.

Trails:

- OHV use
- Non-mechanized use
- Mechanized use
- Motorized use

- Designated trails for either of these?? Is it necessary?
- Signage – concern is too much signage
- Over the snow play area
- Designation of trails
- Historic Use (see wilderness list)
- Cross-country travel should be allowed
- No new trails
- Signage should be low key
- Include information from Wilderness list of brainstorming from last meeting.

Access:

- The trail system should provide adequate access for users. Does it? For appropriate destination?
- Search and Rescue (air ground, all encompassing)
- Motorized public access to public lands – what roads will be open to folks to use
- Private land access issues
- Maintenance levels of access roads
- Are the rules we make going to be enforceable? Enforcement?
- Can we continue to accommodate cattle trailing and providing for historic use in conjunction with recreation?

Conflict among recreation users:

- How are we going to handle increased use at overlooks?
- Noise (limit noise)
- Dark Skies – (avoid light pollution)
- Leave No Trace – (enforce this practice)
- How can we manage ‘light use’ for other activities?
- Recreation uses should be provided- especially during times when we are limiting

Access:

- How do we address conflicts between recreation and other uses like cattle grazing?
- Is there a need to reduce conflicts between livestock and recreation users?

Basic Social Needs:

- How are we going to accommodate some of the basic needs?
- Garbage, other waste products, etc., in the area
- How are we going to be cooperative with other landowners in the area, during the planning, State and Private?
- Are there opportunities for joint planning outside of the management area?

Commercial Outfitters section:

- Aggressively handling unpermitted commercial users/permittees on the Loop Road

Angler Access:

- How do we protect historic angler access?
- How many access roads do we need to afford angler access?

Horse Viewing:

- Continue public access to horse viewing areas
- Continued access for developed and nondeveloped viewing areas (all activities included)

Visual Resource Management:

- How are we handling it?

Wildlife Habitat Management:

- How will BLM manage recreational opportunities while protecting wildlife habitat?
- How will commercial activities be provided for? Access? (fur taking for example)
- BLM activities should not affect/interact with State regulations.
- Provide areas where wildlife viewing could occur - commercial and private.
Have areas where this is the highest value and is managed accordingly.
- Managing both Federal and State Laws together.

Fire Management:

- Juniper Cuts
- Need to evaluate the impacts of Juniper cuts in particular on recreation activities and hunting.
- How will BLM support health and safety of recreationists during peak fire season?
- How will BLM let the users know of fire activity in the area, fire regulations?

Extreme Sports:

- Are there some extreme sports that we think are not appropriate on the mountain?
- Extreme sports users on private land
- Are there sporting or other recreational uses we aren't going to allow?
Segway, paintball, use, etc.

Historical Tribal Activities:

- Include concerns from the list done for Wilderness at the last meeting.

Socio Economic:

- Will and how will any of these identified issues affect landowner's social/economic welfare, lifestyle?
- How will these issues affect Burns/Hines economy?

Helicopter Management/Aviation:

- Possibility of using some sort of aviation for recreation monitoring.

Winter Recreation:

- Can we accommodate over-the-snow snowmobile activity in WSAs?
- Can we accommodate over-the-snow use on open roads?
- Include play area information from Wilderness list

Lands:

- Should BLM acquisition objectives include enhancement of recreation opportunities?

Prescribed Fire Presentation:

Jeff Rose made a presentation to the Council concerning Prescribed Fire Activities on the District, the effectiveness of what has been accomplished, the different types of treatments, the variety of plant communities, and potential projects for upcoming years.

The Council discussed the possibilities for the WJMA (Wildland Juniper Management Area), who might be cooperators, the monies needed and how this could be accomplished.

Motion made and seconded to write a letter requesting funding for WJMA. (Cindy made, Stacy seconded).

Discussion: Although a letter had been written previously, it was felt by many members now was a good time to write another one because the appropriation cycle is in progress for Fiscal Year 04.

No objection to consensus was heard.

Consensus Decision: Write a letter requesting funding for WJMA.

Followup Action Item: Rhonda will draft the WJMA letter.

January 24, 2003

Wanda Johnson left the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

Introductions were made.

Review and Approve December Minutes:

Members reviewed the minutes, making corrections and amendments.

Motion made and seconded to approve the minutes as amended (Stacy moved, Jason seconded)

Discussion: None, no objection to consensus was heard.

Consensus decision: Approve minutes as amended.

Chair and Vice-Chair Election:

Motion made and seconded to stay with the same people as Chair and Vice-Chair (Stacy moved, Ron seconded).

Discussion: Dick discussed some of his views about what he sees as the role of the facilitator. He would add to the roles of the facilitator:

- The facilitator would work with the Chair, Vice-Chair, and DFO to prepare the agenda packet and develop the process for the discussions at the next meeting.
- The facilitator would facilitate or lead the discussion on policy or recommendations

Members talked of their perceptions of what the role of a facilitator is, who should be a facilitator, how they would be involved in the various aspects of the Council meetings, and how they would best serve the Council needs. The Council also discussed the possible additions to the list of roles for the facilitator or if there was even a need to change the described roles.

Cindy suggested the possibility of asking for a specific BLM facilitator, with additional knowledge, who can help work through the more contentious topics.

Stacy felt he would like to see Tom Dyer or the agency person who is leading the discussion be a little more assertive from time to time, or for Dale to let everyone say their peace. If the discussion begins to repeat, Dale would stop the discussion and help the Council take action.

Question called for the motion on the floor.

No objection to consensus was heard.

Consensus Decision: Re-elect the current Chair and Vice-Chair.

Tom Dyer stated he would go ahead and send out an announcement seeking a facilitator based on the input the Council has given him.

Council members discussed various possible statements to add to the role of facilitator, the impacts of each, and the best wording for them.

Motion made and seconded to add the wording, “Helps plan agenda and leads discussion on those agenda items designated by SMAC. SMAC will choose by consensus who would lead that discussion.” (Jason moved, Cindy seconded).

Discussion: Members discussed the appropriate time to determine if a specific facilitator is needed. They believed it would be best done during the meeting when the agenda for the following meeting is discussed. Tom Dyer told the Council when they decide what will be on the next agenda, BLM will know who best from the agency to have available.

Jason withdrew the motion and Cindy agreed to it.

In summary the Council agreed the Chair, vice-Chair, Tom Dyer and Dale will look at the agenda and see if any specific facilitator might be necessary and have that person available.

Transportation Classification and Maintenance Procedures:

Mark Sherbourne, Natural Resource Specialist, BLM, Hines, Oregon, directed the Council members to the copy of the maintenance levels and road definitions in their packet. He informed the group between the last meeting and this one he had added a Maintenance Level 5. When he was preparing management maps and Chapter 2 of the RMP, he realized the Steens Loop Road is currently a Maintenance Level 5. He said it fit level 5 better because it describes most frequently traveled routes within the area. He knows the SMAC recommended level 4, but would like them to reconsider and place it in Level 5.

Motion made and seconded to accept the Road Maintenance Levels 1 through 5 with the adjustment to first sentence in Level 4 be duplicated in Level 5 (Stacy moved, Tom Harris seconded).

Discussion: None. No objection was heard to consensus.

Consensus Decision: Accept Road Maintenance Levels 1 through 5 with the adjustment to first sentence in Level 4 be duplicated in Level 5.

The Council members discussed the different definitions (routes, ways, trails, etc.), what levels are appropriate for different areas, and what was previously put on the map for the different Levels.

Motion made and seconded to retitle this sheet (Route Definitions) to “Primary Purposes for Each Track” (Dick moved, Jason seconded).

Discussion: Cindy pointed out she felt it addresses more than just use, but also some of these may be seasonally open or closed or having limitations. Stacy noted some of these routes will have more than one definition.

Dick withdrew his motion, Jason agreed to the withdrawal.

Motion made and seconded to change the title to “Route Management Categories” (Jerry moved, Dick seconded).

Discussion: None. No objection to consensus heard.

Consensus Decision: Change the title to “Route Management Categories.”

Dick pointed out a punctuation correction which would be to insert a comma after closed and restrictions so the sentence reads: “Routes that are open to the public, but may be closed, or have seasonal”

Motion made and seconded to adopt the Route Management Categories as amended (the 12/5 edition as amended) (Dick moved, Hoyt seconded.).

Discussion: None. No objection to consensus heard.

Consensus Decision: Adopt the 12/5 edition, as amended, of the Route Management Categories.

Mark discussed some of the changes and additions to the maps and the reasons for them since the last meeting. Mark also explained the process and procedures that will be gone through as far as the roads, the RMP, and ONDA’s proposal. He reviewed the purposes for the maps the Council is creating which would be in support of an ongoing inventory effort.

Stacy reviewed information he gathered from landowners concerning the types of various roads and the categories into which they fit, including the cooperatively-managed roads.

Public Comment Period:

Brent Fenty, ONDA, wanted to clarify some points on the ONDA package as well as the reasons. He stated the BLM is responsible under FLPMA to conduct ongoing wilderness inventories of BLM-managed lands and are required to address wilderness and wilderness inventories. He believed an inventory to this level of detail would not have been completed by BLM in this RMP process. Brent wanted to emphasize this was not an attempt to sabotage the planning process and the inventory as part of it. He pointed out the new wilderness

inventory wasn't based on chance boundaries but was determined by four dozen or more volunteers spending thousands of hours in Andrews documenting roads, their quality, and private property boundaries. Brent encouraged Council members to look at the report. He felt they might be surprised at how much consideration went into it. The proposal does exclude some areas from possible wilderness designation. He pointed out to the Council the legislation was a bi-partisan effort and was supported by all the western senators including anti-wilderness and wilderness people. The reason it got consensus is it allowed a lot of activities to continue such as search and rescue. He believes we can all, in some way shape or form, agree in wilderness. The last point he wanted to make was of the 18 million acres of BLM-managed lands, ONDA has proposed one-third of those as wilderness – 10% of Oregon. Currently, Steens is still Oregon's only desert wilderness and this is important to keep in mind. He thanked the group for the work and effort they put into this Council.

Susie Hammond, Hammond Ranches, Inc., Diamond, stated she and Brent aren't on the same page. She hears Brent saying we have legislation and we have wilderness designated within the legislation. This proposal from ONDA is received before the plan is written, and she doesn't see it as constructive. She believes private property has maintained the Mountain with the intent of leave no trace to enhance the economic use. Private landowners have purposely not driven in the same place over and over, and they don't let people who come on their property drive in the same place. This is to avoid leaving tracks going out through places because we know the next person will take it and make a road of it. In the proposal for roadless areas and new wilderness, she read some of the recommended closures and the reasons ONDA wanted this. She asked, "How else are private property owners to get to cattle pens and loading areas?" Landowners had been conscientious and not driven over a road often. Vegetation has overtaken it in areas, yet this is the reason for closing it. So does this mean the landowners should drive over it continually just to keep it out of the proposals for closing? Susie stated they run economic businesses on the Mountain. Sometimes it is not good economics to blade a road, so now there is a double standard to blade or not use it. She thinks ONDA went to a lot of trouble and did a good job. She would like to suggest to the BLM this inventory could be used as a database for roads on the Mountain. Susie suggested the Council should give consideration to the fact all the issues they identified should have a positive affect on the uses on the Mountain.

Don Renie, private landowner, stated he is also a student of the Bible and tithing is to bring back God's blessing and this is a form of tithing which has brought back no blessings. He expressed some disappointment with the BLM staff because he received no letter concerning access. He stated he had visited with Mary Emerick but left with no real resolution. Tom Dyer assured him, the staff will send him a letter, including any documentation we have from his conversation with Mary to ensure all understand what has occurred.

Followup Action Item: Provide Don Renie with an access letter including any documentation BLM has from his conversation with Mary Emerick.

Council members discussed concerns with any road closures stopping necessary access to waterholes, etc., or possibly pushing use off to private land, or the issue of parallel roads that are both still necessary to complete tasks.

Dave Harmon reviewed definitions, IMP, maintenance requirements, requirements during emergency situations, grandfathered activities, possible exceptions, and the requirements for providing reasonable access. He also talked of ways to address areas having resource damage and the maintenance that might be required to stop the damage. Dave clarified some of the means used in the original inventory and the basis on which many decisions were made.

SMAC asked Mark and the BLM to line out two or three options to address the question of access and maintenance as far as NEPA on roads. One possibility is a Cooperative Management Agreement (CMA), but perhaps there are others.

Motion made and seconded to amend the road maintenance level map the SMAC did in December to reflect the additions Stacy presented today (Stacy moved, Tom Harris seconded).

Discussion: Council members discussed the terms that would be used on the base map, and the exact agreement that was to take place.

Motion Amended: Stacy amended his motion to include Steens Loop Road as a Level 5.

No objection to consensus was heard.

Consensus Decision: Amend the road maintenance level map the SMAC did in December to reflect the additions Stacy presented today and include the Steens Loop Road as Maintenance Level 5.

The Group discussed why there would be a need for opening a road that is administratively closed, and there is a camping area which is down in the draw as well as people driving around the sign, and the need for access. Mark will do some research as to why the road was administratively closed.

Followup Action Item: Mark Sherbourne will research why roads were administratively closed.

Motion made and seconded the SMAC recommend to BLM the maintenance categories for road categorizations 3, 4, and 5 be as reflected on the SMAC maintenance map of 1/24/03 (levels, 3, 4 and 5), except for the short piece of road that goes from the Loop Road to Fir Creek. Also, the BLM do research and

determine the appropriate piece of Moon Hill Road. (Stacy made and Jason seconded.)

Discussion: None. No objection to consensus was heard.

Consensus Decision: SMAC recommend to BLM the maintenance categories for roads categorizations 3, 4, 5 be as reflected on the map SMAC maintenance map of 1/24/03 (levels, 3, 4 and 5), except for the short piece of road that goes from the Loop Road to Fir Creek. Also that the BLM do research and determine the appropriate piece of Moon Hill Road that fits.

Followup Action Item: BLM will research and determine the main portion of Moon Hill Road.

The Council discussed how they would address Levels 1 and 2, and the possible need to address transportation and recreation together to make sure the needs are being met appropriately. Knowledge of on-the-ground conditions would also make a difference in the decisions made by members. Also discussed was the possibility of leaving some roads open as Level 2 then monitoring to see if there have been any adverse impacts.

Motion made and seconded to leave them as Level 2 and through monitoring decide which will remain Level 2 and which will become Level 1. If monitoring shows there are problems, then it would be reclassified as a one (Hoyt made and Harland seconded).

Discussion: Council discussed the application of this motion on-the-ground as well as the fact interim decisions are still possible. Some proposed waiting until the next meeting.

An objection was heard to the motion (Jason)

Roll call: Dick – No; Jerry – No; Alice – No; Hoyt - Yes; E Ron –Yes; Jason - No; Cindy - Yes; Stacy – Yes; Tom H –Yes; Harland - Yes

Motion failed.

Council members discussed how the various Levels would fit under the different RMP alternatives and how to address identifying which roads/routes, etc., fit into which category. Mark gave members a copy of the working document of the transportation plan. This is an inhouse document at this point, and asked SMAC members to review and comment on it.

WSA Access Issue:

Tom Dyer explained the corners that have arisen about the map connected with the legislation and an area of access that appears to go through the wilderness.

There are varying points of view as to how this should be addressed both because of wilderness and the access it provides to the surrounding countryside. Members discussed the impacts, the alternatives of how to deal with the situation, and whether or not it would have to be fixed legislatively.

Motion made and seconded to consider the Three Springs Road as an open road (Stacy moved, Ron seconded).

Discussion: Members identified legislation as one means of altering not only this situation but several others, whether or not cherry stemming was appropriate, and if a road could be open in wilderness.

An objection was heard to the motion (Jerry)

Roll Call Vote: Dick – Yes; Jerry – No; Alice – No; Hoyt -Yes; ERon -Yes; Jason -Yes; Cindy - Yes; Tom H – Yes; Stacy –Yes; Harland –Yes;

Motion failed with only eight votes.

Followup Action Item: Members requested to be kept informed of the course of action BLM takes concerning this road. Tom will come back at the next meeting with more information.

Wildlife Presentation:

Matt Obradovich, Wildlife Biologist with the Burns District, introduced himself and gave the Council a briefing on wildlife issues, habitat, monitoring, restoration efforts, impacts of juniper encroachment and prescribed fire projects, coordination with ODFW, recreation impacts to wildlife, road travel impacts on wildlife, specific areas that might need additional protection, and aspects of cooperative agreements with private landowners and the benefits.

March Agenda and Meeting Review:

Council members expressed their concern of how to ensure all interested persons were aware of the ONDA proposal and the possible ramifications.

Members discussed proposed topics for March's agenda.

Members felt this meeting had been effective and the good discussions had added to it. Jerry complimented Susie Hammond on how gracious she was in discussing a very stressful issue. Jason complimented Dale on his effectiveness as a facilitator. Tom Dyer talked of the need to try to stay focused on the topic, discuss it, and make a recommendation and move on. He pointed out there are a lot of issues that will be coming up and the need to address them quickly is going to increase.

Meeting adjourned.

Submitted by Liz Appelman

The SMAC approved the January 2003 meeting minutes as amended on March 4, 2003.

Certified by:

Tom Harris, SMAC Chair

March 4, 2003
Date